

vote in favor of the referendum. We have found through past experience that the National Student Association does not function for the benefit of college students. All activities engaged in by the Association are and have been in the past for the benefit of certain select individuals. The American college student is merely being used as a front."—Elmer Blumenkamp, Executive Secretary, Theta Xi.

"The organization is controlled by a select group and is not representative of the membership in the organization, and the controlling group is more politically minded than is proper. The group which issues statements in behalf of the organization is self-perpetuating to a large degree and does not reflect the attitude and opinion of the general membership. There is, of course, question as to the democratic nature of the organization. I know that many schools have withdrawn from the organization recently for the above reasons. My recommendation to you would be to oppose the affiliation."—Jack L. Anson, National Secretary, Phi Kappa Tau.

"Most fraternity and sorority leaders oppose affiliation and with good reason. I think the motives of the organization and the quality and direction of its leadership is extremely suspect. I would urge you to give more careful consideration to this question. NSA has proved to be a most disruptive influence with very little to recommend it."—Mrs. Russell Strickland, National Panhellenic Delegate, Delta Gamma.

"We have been unable to learn of any benefit that would accrue to the members of fraternal organizations by virtue of the affiliation of the student body with NSA."—Harold Buchanan, Executive Secretary, Delta Chi.

"This organization is divisive and does not truly work for the best interests of the students in many cases. There is a new organization called the Associated Student Governments of the United States, and if they live up to their stated principles, I think this will have much more value to the student body than does NSA."—Bruce Melchert, Executive Secretary, Tau Kappa Epsilon.

"Alpha Phi believes that the National Student Association as presently constituted is antidemocratic in character and is unrepresentative of the majority of the students in the United States. We are opposed to this organization in its present form."—LaVerne Harvey, Executive Secretary, Alpha Phi.

YOU MUST DECIDE

The solution of the NSA question is up to you. The National Student Association has a number of paid staff people who work full time attempting to convince the American student community and the general public that NSA is, in fact, the legitimate representative of the American student. Thousands of students have recognized this deceit and have worked diligently on their individual campuses to obtain a decision to leave the ranks of NSA. The list of schools which have either ousted NSA or which have rejected membership in the Association has grown tremendously since 1961. Today, NSA "represents" less than fifteen per cent (15%) of the colleges, universities, and junior colleges in the United States which are, according to the NSA Constitution, eligible for membership in the Association. If your college or university is presently affiliated with NSA or if your school is presently considering affiliation with NSA, then it is up to you to act and expose NSA for what it really is—a fantastic fraud.

NASSER THREATENS THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from New York [Mr. FARBSTAIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker it is reported in the morning press that President Nasser has once again resorted to his habit of blackmail against the United States to keep his hands free for troublemaking in the Middle East.

The Egyptian President, according to this report, has said he contemplates defaulting on his debts to the United States. These debts, let me remind you, have been incurred not because this country is engaged in any profitmaking endeavors in Egypt but because we answered Nasser's pleas to help feed his starving countrymen. To some extent, the Egyptian people are starving because President Nasser diverts his agricultural resources to buy arms from the Communist bloc. Now he has the audacity to say he will not pay us what he owes us, though his is a solemn obligation incurred by one sovereign state to another. I wonder if President Nasser understands the obligation of sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to use aid as a lever to influence a country's domestic practices. Of this, we must be very careful; but it is another to use aid to influence a country's foreign policies in the direction of peace. That is a legitimate, in fact an essential, characteristic of our aid programs, in my mind. But that is precisely what President Nasser is complaining about.

I would not give Nasser another grain of wheat if he pursues the practice of disturbing Middle Eastern tranquility. It is my view that we should tell him, in the face of the blackmail threat, to find some other way to feed his people. It is he, after all, not the United States, who is responsible to them in the first instance. I suggest we give President Nasser no further assistance until he learns we will not submit to his threats, his insults, his blackmail, until he learns to grow up and behave like a responsible leader.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure of CIA links to the National Student Association, to the American Newspaper Guild, to American business foundations, has caused an uproar in high Government circles and in the little precinct.

The President has called for an investigation, the Vice President is appalled, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is deeply concerned—and understandably enough—the president of the National Student Association, according to a Washington newspaper, "has gotten sick to his stomach."

This whole sad story is tragic indeed, especially to the reputation and worth of the Nation's largest student organization. But in an area where the right hand is never supposed to know what the left hand is doing, it is completely ludicrous to discover that the left hand did not even know what the left hand had been doing.

The Central Intelligence Agency is an arm of the executive branch, sitting on the National Security Council in an advisory role to the President. Yet he did not know of these connections which have existed since the early 1950's.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities must be chagrined that left-leaning students and labor leaders who have so aroused its ire are representatives of organizations financed and perhaps guided by a Government agency it previously considered an unimpeachable ally. It would be an amusing spectacle to see the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Central Intelligence Agency investigate each other. The CIA could use as a motive that everything in the universe belongs properly in its balliwick; HUAC might forthrightly insist upon its mission to expose all truly un-American influence, covert and obvious, on the American way of life.

Last summer Members of the U.S. Senate solemnly refused to increase the membership of the CIA Oversight Committee. In the words of one Senator:

The primary objective has always been to avoid leaks.

Declared another Senator in the same debate:

Senators are not always good security risks. It seems to me that anybody who is involved on a Committee of this sort should be picked by those who are best at keeping secrets after they have had several years to observe him as one of those who keeps secrets best.

Well, they kept the secret all right. If the CIA would not tell the President, then the Oversight Committee in not informing him, itself, completely lived up to its name by committing the biggest oversight possible.

In intelligence operations I am informed that overclassification—that is, classifying information "top secret" when it should be treated merely as confidential, for instance—is considered a great bottleneck both to security and efficient operations. Not informing the President of the United States as to the full extent that the CIA's tentacles had wound their way into America's private life has to be one of the biggest overclassification blunders in which the Agency has ever partaken. Lord grant that there are no others.

In a month when the birthdays of Lincoln and Washington give occasion to prideful speeches about our Republic and the liberty and freedom that it has fostered, it is ironic that simultaneously another creation of this same Republic should be the object of indignant headlines which augur up the haunting image of "Big Brother."

What is this organization that deems it necessary to make secret connection with the educational, labor, and business communities of the United States? What is this CIA that it should be the arbiter of what is right and just?

The chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee has announced his intention for an inquiry into the CIA's links past and present with U.S. universities. I support him in this endeavor. Perhaps indeed it will be found that a law is needed requiring the registration of Government agencies trying to influence education just as we have laws

February 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 1729

requiring lobbyists who try to influence Congress to register.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], has my sincere support for his resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 207, which would set up a joint congressional Committee on Central Intelligence. It is high time that this overclassification be ended and that this Congress know what is going on for the interests and security of the American people. In the words of the intelligence community, Mr. Speaker, this Congress has a "need to know."

Another sad commentary in this episode which has undeniably weakened citizen trust in government and further widened the so-called credibility gap is the obvious mistrust the leaders in this democratic society have had for democratic institutions.

If such governmental support was necessary to further international contact between students and labor leaders, it not only would have looked better had it been done openly, and it not only would have avoided the embarrassment which now faces us, but it would have made it possible for these private ambassadors to claim that this Republic is proud of its diversity in ideas and ambition; it would have made it possible for this Republic to proclaim that apologists and critics are equal as patriots.

My colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], has suggested the establishment of an independent foundation supported by Government funds which would give assistance to private bodies, political, professional, and educational, in their endeavors to help represent their segment of American society to the world at large. This is a proposal which merits study and consideration.

At this point I include several outstanding editorials on the events of the last few days in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 16, 1967]

KISS OF DEATH

The National Student Association is reportedly giving consideration to folding its whole organization because it has been fatally compromised by the disclosure that it has been the recipient of secret subsidies from the Central Intelligence Agency. The leaders of the student group will be wise to terminate its existence. It is not likely to recover enough credibility at home or abroad to make its activities at all worth while.

The covert, concealed, dishonest support of the Government is the kiss of death for any group holding itself out as a private, independent, non-governmental agency. Other organizations which have similarly accepted undisclosed governmental support will be well advised to quietly fold tents and give up the field. Even the open financial support by Government of nongovernmental academic and professional groups is sometimes compromising; but secret financial support is invariably so. The very resort to secrecy cries out against the integrity of the recipient. Every such subsidy indicts both giver and receiver. The Government agency, on its part, it tacitly acknowledging that disclosure would be fatal to its purposes. The whole transaction, from beginning to end, is touched with fraud and evasion. The very fact of secrecy transforms even what might be a legitimate cooperation into what obviously is an impenetrable conspiracy. And

those who are caught in such a conspiracy cannot hope to regain credibility.

The Central Intelligence Agency, whatever good it has been doing, has been, at the same time, busily engaged in diminishing the credibility of all nongovernmental associations and organizations. This is a profound and serious national loss that it will be difficult to repair. We can only begin to repair it if the Government promptly and plainly puts an end to all such secret subventions and if private establishments join in binding themselves to a policy under which they are committed to refuse any secret Federal subsidies.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1967]
SUBVERSION BY CIA

The disastrous effects of the systematic penetration of American educational, cultural and labor organizations by the Central Intelligence Agency daily become more apparent. The strength of these organizations, both in the structure of American society and in their relations with their opposite numbers in other nations, always has been their freedom from government domination.

Now, through the deviousness of C.I.A. operations, thousands of scholars, students, unionists and professional leaders discover long after the fact that they have performed unwitting and undesired duty as secret agents.

The integrity of pro-American positions, honestly taken by groups and individuals in the worldwide battle of ideas, has been undermined. The independence of America's private foundations has been brought into question. In short, faith in American institutions has been besmirched in a way that would have eluded the reach of any foreign enemy.

It is no excuse to say that the C.I.A.'s decision to use a limitless range of philanthropic fronts to funnel its funds into youth groups, universities and other private institutions was designed to meet a very real problem of the cold war: the need for assuring that the Communists would not have an unchallenged field in the youth congresses and cultural conferences they were arranging—and subsidizing—on a global basis ten and fifteen years ago. That problem should have been met openly—by direct public subsidy.

It should have been clear long ago to the C.I.A.'s overseers in the White House that the end effect of clandestine subsidies to groups representative of the detachment and diversity of a free society must inevitably taint the genuineness of their detachment. This would be true even without the charges that have now developed of the assignment of C.I.A. operatives to influence the policy statements and choice of officers of the National Student Association—a practice that may have extended to other organizations as well.

The health of a democratic society depends on the certainty that its free institutions—its press, its educational and scientific bodies, its publishing houses and television networks, its unions and business organizations—are truly free. That does not mean government is barred from underwriting international exchanges or research study; it means that, where such support is appropriate, it must be given openly through its own public agencies.

The worst part of the current mess is that the very nature of the C.I.A., with its mandate for espionage and subversion all over the world, rules out any thoroughgoing public inquiry into its activities. That means some residue of suspicion is sure to remain—both in this country and abroad—no matter how conscientiously the Cabinet Committee appointed last week by President Johnson seeks to formulate policies that will prevent the C.I.A. or any other Federal bureau from

imperiling the "integrity and independence" of educational institutions.

When a government finds it necessary to set up an agency to fight subversion with subversion everywhere, the tragic danger it opens up is that among the people it subverts are its own. The defense against such weakening of America's institutional fabric must rest with the President and Congress. Even with the recent broadening of Senator Russell's watchdog committee, Congress is not doing its part of that job.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1967]

THE CIA: A CASE OF ADDICTION

Shortly after the CIA's fiasco at the Bay of Pigs, a leading figure in the Kennedy Administration who was asked to perform a dispassionate post-mortem observed that this country's foreign policy, over a dozen years of intense Cold War strain, had come to rely on what he called "two kinds of dope."

"When all the usual, conventional political remedies failed," he said, "the first impulse has usually been toward foreign aid—to try to buy our way out of trouble. The last resort has been to dump the mess on CIA."

The result, he concluded, was that the Intelligence organization, while manned by men of exceptional competence, was being asked to perform all manner of outlandish—and in some cases impossible—missions to recoup the mistakes of Cabinet Secretaries and Presidents. Cuba, for one example, was a terminal case when it was handed to CIA.

What we are witnessing—and may be witnessing on an ever-widening scale—are the ravages of this addiction laid bare. The case of the National Students Association doubtless began innocently enough in the grim Cold War atmosphere of the late 40s and early 50s, when communism and McCarthyism were both riding high. Communist groups were grabbing for control of international organizations of all sorts—students, professional, labor. Private American groups, affiliated to these international bodies, lacked the money and in many cases the know-how with which to fight back, and many were leftist-oriented, by American standards, which ruled out open United States Government support in the McCarthy age. Congress, moreover, would have wanted any Government-backed delegation to follow the Government's line with fine fidelity. (Ironically, those who are covertly subsidized and don't know it are more likely to be faithful to their true feelings.)

So the clandestine tack was almost irresistible, what with all those unvouchered CIA funds for which no public accounting need be made. For this same reason, long after the need for deception passed, it was tempting to continue along the covert route, rather than battle Congress for more money for the State Department's restricted budget.

Covert operations are seductive in this, and other ways. When they work, they can work remarkably well, as testified to by any number of unsung and unsingable successes, and some, such as the overthrow of Iran's recalcitrant, uncooperative Mossadegh, which have come to light long after the fact. But success has a spoiling effect, carrying with it a false sense of security. Complacency sets in. Ends begin to justify whatever means. Moral issues evaporate. So does simple prudence. Who bothered to check up on the U-2 flight plans (another stunning Intelligence success) as the day drew near for the abortive Big Four summit meeting in May, 1960? Who is now asking whether the program of aerial reconnaissance over Cuba, and the contingency plans on hand in case of mishap, are still as valid now, given possible improvements in Soviet anti-aircraft technology, as they were when the program was last reviewed.

If addiction is what's involved, the cure suggests itself. It lies not in banning all covert activity, any more than drug addiction argues

H1730

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 23, 1967

for banning medically supervised use of barbiturates. The cure lies in tight control. The first move, long advocated by this newspaper, ought to be a clean break between CIA's intelligence-gathering and its "operations," or as they are better known, "dirty tricks." Intelligence data can too easily be bent into a compelling argument for this or that covert project when the two are conducted under one roof. Secondly, covert operations need the closest sort of case-by-case supervision by the White House and by men in the regular departments, whose main concern isn't dirty tricks, but the day-to-day, aboveboard conduct of foreign policy in a way which takes into account the Government's moral standing at home and abroad.

But even this is not enough; covert operations corrupt everybody involved in time. The eye becomes jaded, the sense of outrage dulled; what's been done before becomes the norm. Nor can the watchman's role be played by Congress, where pragmatism is rampant and morality too often expressed in terms of an Adam Clayton Powell or a Bobby Baker; where practical politics has a covert quality of its own.

What's really needed, beyond a fresh start to wipe away as much as possible the stigma past conduct has cast on almost every private institution in the land, is a new kind of control mechanism, capable of bringing to bear a chronically jaundiced eye. This probably means a panel whose personnel is constantly changed to refresh its innocence. The old establishmentarians won't do; too many of them were involved in the prescription which produced the addiction. Indeed, the search for unsullied individuals or even categories, in the present atmosphere, becomes nearly ludicrous. Would you believe a lighthouse keeper, an Arctic explorer, or perhaps a forest ranger or the headmistress of a young ladies finishing school?

One might begin by assembling a panel from the ranks of the unwitting and reconciled past members, over the years, of NSA.

Where the Administration cannot afford to begin—much less end in an age where credibility has become a household anxiety—is with the old, familiar palliatives of an in-house review, or even the threadbare standby of a one-shot inquiry by distinguished private citizens. Shocking revelations call for shock treatment, however agonizing the wrench of withdrawal may turn out to be.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 22, 1967]

WASHINGTON: THE CIA AND THE UNANSWERED QUESTION (By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 21—After all the mysterious disclosures about the Central Intelligence Agency's secret operations among the students and foundations of America, one mystery remains: Why did all the intelligent people around the President not intervene to change the policy before it became a public scandal?

Almost all of them are now saying the policy was obsolete if not wrong. The President has stopped it. The Vice President has criticized it publicly. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, John Gardner, has condemned the C.I.A., directed by his friend, Richard Helms, for carrying it on. Bobby Kennedy, who presided over it when he was Attorney General, has sniped at it and at the President in private. The Under Secretary of State, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Gardner, and Helms are now heading a Johnson committee to transform the whole system, and all this raises a fundamental question.

Why, if they all agree now it is wrong, did they not put that question to the President before? Why, if they condemn the press for "embarrassing" the President and his Administration now, did they not protect him earlier from a system, they now concede should have been exposed long ago?

THE FUTURE PROBLEM

So much has been written about this in the last week that everybody here is bored with it, and the Administration is so vulnerable to criticism that it is almost embarrassing to continue the controversy. But looking to the future, there is still a fundamental and unresolved problem. The machinery of the Government for reviewing policies which become obsolete with the passage of time is obviously defective. The officials now dealing with the controversy concede the point, and they are trying to deal with the limited question of the C.I.A. and the students, but they are still not really dealing with the larger question of policy-making that produced the C.I.A. controversy in the first place. That question is how can the Government keep policies up to date?

The interesting thing about this is that the Administration had various committees to perform precisely the function of answering these questions in relation to the C.I.A. Bobby Kennedy headed one to review the C.I.A.'s activities after the fiasco at the Bay of Pigs in 1961. The Secretary of State was given the task at that time of supervising the C.I.A.'s activities overseas. Senator Richard Russell of Georgia was assigned the job of watching the C.I.A. for the Congress. And the President's personal friend, Clark Clifford, was asked to preside over an outside committee to watch the intelligence activities of the Government.

Apparently none of these committees, however, either knew anything about what the C.I.A. was doing with its secret funds for students, labor unions, magazines, and radio stations such as Radio Free Europe, or they approved what President Johnson's own closest associates now criticize.

The Administration, under both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, had an interdepartmental committee to deal with the intelligence activities. Johnson, now U.S. Ambassador to Japan, and Cyrus Vance, Under Secretary of Defense, worked with Richard Helms, head of the C.I.A., on this problem.

Under President Johnson now, Walt Rostow of the White House staff, Vance of the Pentagon, Foy Kohler, former U.S. Ambassador in Moscow, and Helms still meet regularly to supervise intelligence problems, but none of these committees of extraordinarily able men apparently felt that the secret financing of students, labor unions, magazines, or radio stations was a major political issue.

SOMETHING IS WRONG

Even the Johnson intimates in the Government concede that something is wrong here. They are irritated with the press for exposing the facts. They concede the C.I.A. policy toward the students should be changed. But they have still not dealt with the major problem, which is that the Administration's machinery for reviewing policy is defective; that the Cabinet and the National Security Council are not operating to check overall policy, and that the State Department still does not really know what the C.I.A. is doing.

This is the issue that is troubling Washington now. It is really the same issue that has been bothering the capital about Vietnam—a tendency to drift into unintended situations; a failure of the machinery of government to review old policies until it is too late.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 23, 1967]

INTELLIGENCE AND DIRTY TRICKS (By Walter Lippmann)

The CIA problem is embarrassing and it is a disagreeable subject to talk about. But it is so important that we cannot sweep it under the rug and try to forget about it. For the good faith of the United States government has been compromised by the disclosure that we have been doing what we have been doing.

about it, we cannot conduct the affairs of the United States in a cloud of suspicion. We must dispel the suspicion and restore confidence in our good faith.

We may begin by noting that the cloud of suspicion is much wider than the actual operations of the CIA could possibly warrant. Anyone with experience in the outer world must realize that the CIA is almost automatically suspected of being implicated in or of being the prime mover in all manner of happenings abroad. It would be no exaggeration to say that outside the United States the CIA has become the universal scapegoat for any rightist activity which people on the left and in the center dislike. The CIA has acquired a legendary character and its activities are rather like the exploits of superman.

The CIA legend feeds on the fact that the agency has in fact done somewhere some of the things it is accused of doing everywhere all the time. It has overturned governments in Iran and Guatemala. It has organized an invasion of a foreign country in the Bay of Pigs. In the old days it interfered with money in elections in France and Italy. It has subsidized the foreign activities of students, scholars, journalists, churchmen, labor leaders; it has paid for radio stations and magazines abroad. Although these operations have been visible enough, they have been financed secretly. The secrecy has prevented reliable knowledge as to where the real CIA activities end and where the suspected and imaginary ones begin.

In this way the cloud of suspicion has been generated which envelops so large a part of American action in the rest of the world.

We may go on to note that the Americans are the only people who have not shared in this general suspicion.

There have, of course, been charges and exposures made by minorities on the American left and right. But until recently the great majority have taken for granted the purity of the government's motives and the innocence of its actions. The secrecy of the operation shielded it from suspicion in this country, and with very little questioning and argument the Congress has voted secret funds of unknown size for which there is no public accounting.

If we push deeper into the matter we find, I believe, that the root of the trouble is that the Central Intelligence Agency has been used for much more than genuine intelligence work. It has been used as a propaganda agency, as a superior diplomatic foreign service, as an agency for clandestine intervention in foreign countries. The breadth of the CIA's authorized activities has not only generated the cloud of suspicion over American action abroad but it has spoiled the CIA as an intelligence agency here at home.

The prime example of this was the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. In that affair the CIA organized an invasion of Cuba. As an intelligence agency, however, it was supposed to advise the President about the prospects of the invasion and the probable reaction of the Cubans. Because the same CIA men who were running the invasion had also to advise the President on its prospects, their optimism got the better of their intelligence and the President received wholly wrong advice. Thus he was led into a disaster which very nearly wrecked the Kennedy Administration at the outset.

After the Bay of Pigs President Kennedy was urged to cut the CIA apart, separating sharply the business of intelligence from the business of propaganda and intervention. Unhappily, President Kennedy did not take this advice and, after a little tinkering with personnel and with the details, he left intact the secret conglomerate which is known as CIA.

There will be and there can be no solution to the problem, I believe, unless there is a surgical operation which separates true intelligence from the propaganda and intervention which has become a part of its character.

February 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H1731

other activities. An intelligence agency should deal with espionage, research and analysis. The other activities, propaganda, intervention and dirty tricks should not be in the intelligence agency. They should not be under the same roof, they should not be manned by the same men and they should not be under the same men and they should not be under the same cloak of secrecy.

There is little doubt that this will improve the integrity of the true intelligence work. What will it do to the other operations if they are divorced from the CIA as a secret intelligence agency? Secret propaganda would be abolished. This would make more credible open and avowed propaganda. By taking the business of intervening in foreign countries out of the CIA, the temptation to intervene will be diminished. This would in itself be a good thing, and in the rare cases where intervention was a vital necessity, it could be set up secretly enough in the Defense Department. As to the dirty tricks, like bribing a politician somewhere abroad, the American Republic will survive if such dirty tricks are not performed.

BURIAL FOR VETERANS

(Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. ICHORD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much annoyed to read the story in today's New York Times which attributed to "White House spokesmen" statements that tend to cast a slur on every person who ever served in the Armed Forces.

The story concerned the recently announced decision to expand certain national cemeteries, including the Beverly National Cemetery in New Jersey. The article stated that the decision had been reached "reluctantly" and had been made only because Vietnam war dead were being turned away.

Although there have been many instances of men killed in Vietnam being refused burial in certain of these national cemeteries, there have also been a much larger number of veterans of other wars turned away for the same reason—lack of space. We are naturally more cognizant of the sacrifices of our servicemen in Vietnam, but we should never forget the equally great sacrifices of those who fought in prior wars. A man who fought in World War I, World War II, or the Korean war should have no less weight in coming to a determination to reopen these cemeteries.

Ever since the Defense Department first announced the closing of Beverly I have been urging expansion. The final decision to follow this course is welcome, but long overdue.

I might also point out here that the Times story cited the figure of "half billion dollars" as the cost of expansion. The correct figure is \$642,500 to acquire and develop a total of 32 acres.

I would hope that the decision to expand these cemeteries was made in recognition of the gift of sacrifice made to our country by the veterans of every war and every period in our history. The contributions our veterans have made in the past, and that are being made today, demand that we make the meager provision of a final resting place,

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. DADDARIO (at the request of Mr. ICHORD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, when President Woodrow Wilson signed the first National Vocational Education Act on February 23, 1917, the act made possible the creation of practical vocational education programs which have proven to be of greater and greater service to the people of Connecticut and of the Nation.

Connecticut's programs over the past 50 years have been of distinguished service. The executive board of the Connecticut Vocational Association has drawn attention to the 50th anniversary date.

The role of vocational education in constructing a better future and providing more opportunities for all our people has been attracting increasing interest. The Congress has, in recent years, strengthened the abilities of our school systems to furnish skills for today's and tomorrow's jobs. It is fitting that we notice what has been done over the years as we meet the needs for what can be done.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. GIAIMO (at the request of Mr. ICHORD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago on February 23, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson signed into law the first National Vocational Education Act—the Smith-Hughes Act. This landmark legislation as amended and supplemented has been the basis of the Federal effort in the field of vocational training.

The Smith-Hughes Act was prompted by a realization that it was a duty of the Federal Government to help prepare youth and adults for employment and to assist the employed workers in gaining advancement through additional training. Furthermore, the Smith-Hughes Act established one of the earliest programs of cooperative federalism, with the Federal Government providing funds and helping to promote, develop, and improve programs, but the States administering the program. This early experiment in joint cooperation has been a model the Congress has followed in establishing many programs. The foresight of our earlier colleagues in establishing this vocational training program is to be commended.

I am proud to have been a member of the Education and Labor Committee in the 87th Congress, and to have played a part in reevaluating the Federal role in these programs. Two important amendments were recommended by my committee at that time. Both became laws. The first established the manpower training and development program designed to retrain workers with obsolete skills for new jobs. The second amendment extended the title VIII program of the National Defense Education Act to

promote training in scientific and technical fields.

In order to meet the demands of our growing economy, our workers must be qualified in skills that will be useful in the future. The Vocational Education Act assists them in this regard and helps us assure the continued prosperity of our Nation.

TO AMEND THE FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT

(Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. ICHORD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the priorities cited by President Johnson in his state of the Union message was the need "to do more for the consumer." Definite proposals toward this objective were contained in the President's recent message to protect the American consumer. In the field of added protection for people against hazards in their homes, there was a specific recommendation to broaden and strengthen the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953.

The original act was designed to remove from the market certain highly flammable articles of clothing, such as the famous "torch sweaters." In this purpose, the act succeeded. However, it did not affect the marketing of other clothing, still on the market today, some of which is extremely flammable. Furthermore, the original act did not attempt to deal with the broader problem of interior furnishings, which can also pose a threat to safety.

Accordingly, I have introduced a bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953, to make it more responsive to the problems of today. A quarter of a million people are burned each year in America from fires originating in highly flammable fabrics. That is the problem in sheer numbers. When we take a closer look, however, we find a disproportionate number of victims are the very young and the very old, those least able to protect themselves. There is another facet to stimulate all of us to action. As is well known, burns represent a very delicate medical problem, requiring a great deal of time, care, and expense in the treatment.

The amendments in the bill I have introduced would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to revise the existing standards for wearing apparel, to give people more protection. Standards could also be issued for interior furnishings such as draperies, rugs, blankets, upholstery, foam padding, if the Secretary determines that there is a need for flammability standards for these products. There would be a study of the causes of deaths, injuries, and property losses resulting from clothing and household material fires, conducted jointly by the Department of Commerce and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Finally, the amendments would authorize the conduct of laboratory research into the flammability of furnishings, fabrics, and materials.

I think these amendments are urgently needed. At the same time, I believe them